

FWP13

27 APRIL-2May1995/pjf
and 4-5 May 1995/pjf

OD X and XI: INTERPRETATION
Two alternative interpretive models,
MODELS 1 and 2,
(parallel with, but not yet certainly replacing, the long-standing interpretation expressed in
FYFOD WP 1)
followed by
a modified version of the second model, constituting
MODEL 3

*Editorial note: this third Model was developed with Tessa Gingell as Model 2 was read to her over the phone when she was on the point of completing her pottery report on 4 May. This happened as this paper, containing Models 1 and 2, was being printed out into multiple copies for circulation; but just as Model 1 had earlier been overtaken during its later gestation by a ceramic injection to produce Model 2, so the second version of this rapid interpretive odyssey was modified into a third edition in a matter of days. Anyone using this paper should follow Model 3 as the currently preferred interpretation and can go straight to it; but all three Models are reproduced here seriatim as they developed as a matter of record - and in case we want to return to them. Model 3, it must be stressed, is NOT final, but merely the best adjustment as of 5 May of structural and ceramic evidence; with a lot of other evidence still to be taken into account. Will anyone else using this, or wishing to make adjustments to it, please accept what TG/pjf agreed i.e. that, **however many other phases may be needed earlier and later, label the earliest enclosed EIA settlement Phase 3b: that is our fixed point** for relative as well as absolute chronologies.*

List of illustrations:

*frontespiece: copy of Crawford and Keiller, Wessex from the Air, 1928, 124-125, Pl. XIX: Overton Down
Fig. 0: overall site plan plus excavation*

Figs. 1-5 relate to Model 2 only

Fig. 1: diagrammatic representation of present earthworks, with Phase 1 (Beaker graves)

Fig. 2: Phase 2: ?BA fields

Fig. 3a: Phase 3A: ?LBA settlement

Fig. 3b: Phase 3B: ?very early EIA enclosed settlement

Fig. 3c: Phase 3C: ?late EIA enclosed settlement

Fig. 4: Phase 4: late EIA or RB reversion to fields

Fig. 5: Phase 5: C13 arable fields

Fig. 6: annotated plan of excavated areas ODXI/A, East 2 and 3, showing Gullies, ard-marks etc

Figs. 7-10 relate to Model 3 only:

Fig. 7: Phase 3a/ ii

Fig. 8: Phase 3b

Fig. 9: Phase 3c/ i

Fig. 10: Phase 3c/ ii

Model 1 (not illustrated):

this is a new interpretation of the whole site developed during a detailed scrutiny of the excavated structural evidence while working towards a first draft of the excavation report during the week 20 April. It follows from a realisation that the ard-marks, regarded for 30 years as the terminal horizon for activity on the site, could be:

a) of more than one chronological phase (as distinct from being what has always been recognised i.e. representing different 'ploughings' within the same phase of activity - see original 3rd interim in WAM and Antiquity 1967)

b) and therefore of any phase before the 'last ploughing' e.g. even before the enclosed settlement.

The sequence could therefore be something like this, a much more complex and dynamic evolution than represented by the Beaker graves-settlement with fields- fields over settlement interpretation of FWP 1:

Beaker graves

Field system reconstructed on site plan in area of later settlement from hints of pre-settlement layout; includes ard-marks, and establishes open downland later reflected in ditch micro-fauna

(from here on, any of the phases could contain all, some or none of the considerable number of pits, PHs or stakeholes etc which puncture the site and in most cases are stratigraphically unrelated to anything else except perhaps later ard-marks)

Unenclosed occupation within one specific but hypothetical field:

pits 22/23, PH8 (cf ODXII)

: pits under NW Gully 1

: working hollows in South 1

Gully 6, probably with G5 and perhaps with G4: an elaborate structure but with no big PHs, no certain hearth and with each of the annexes containing a large central pit

Enclosed settlement within bank and ditch, roughly tripling the settlement area compared to that of the field: contains buildings represented by G1 and in South 1 and probably G8: 3 simple round houses (except for annexe on G1) all with SE, probably porched, entrances, a hearth and some internal fittings

Bank shoved into ditch; some 'late' occupation, notably P20 cutting G8, which may be pre-destruction (perhaps going with G1 or South 1 houses if either can be shown to be late ceramically?), contemporary or post-destruction

Fields re-occupy settlement area, their boundaries on slightly different lines from pre-settlement system and more ard-marks are made, everywhere crossing settlement remains. Perhaps double-lynchet track past S end of settlement enclosure inserted at this stage? - see below

If not the same as last, area re-cultivated in Roman period

Perhaps part of the last phase but perhaps a later one of late-Roman date, double lynchet track cuts through fields, respecting S line of EIA enclosure ditch which had been long filled in (but had it? maybe that trackway is itself of EIA origin tho' it no doubt connects RB settlements; but perhaps they are where they are because they are along a pre-existing track, or perhaps are themselves EIA in origin tho' only producing RB pottery on surface); and positive lynchet piles up against N side of track over the top of the

EIA ditch, showing that cultivation was contemporary. In fact this DL phase could be of EIA date, cutting through LBA fields as part of new layout which also saw razing of settlement and re-division of its area into fenced fields)

Medieval cultivation in strips, producing ridge-and-furrow within `Celtic` field pattern

Sheep-grazing (producing `old grassland`)

Military activity in 1940s (can we find out more about this? - Home Guard or `real`?)

1950s-90s: Sheep AND cattle pasture, with major conservation interest

1960s: archaeological excavations

(end of new Model 1 phasing)

It should be stressed that the above was conceived without benefit of any ceramic or other analyses. The specific trigger was the observation that the ard-marks on the eastern edge of East 3 were relatively well-preserved in a marked cluster close to the straight length of ditch bounding the E side of the EIA enclosure; and the consequential thought that this good preservation might well have been occasioned by the marks having been sealed by the (largely hypothetical) bank presumably going along with the enclosure ditch (thus allowing for the circular argument that because the ard-marks were well-preserved, there must have been an enclosing bank with the ditch!). Right or wrong, the thought released interpretation from the rigidity of a model in which everything had to be earlier than ard-marks and, consequently, a land-use change from settlement to fields happened only once. Since such a land-use change was the central point of the original hypothesis on which, following Crawford's 1928 AP (*frontespiece*), the excavation had been initiated, the matter is fairly central to interpretation and indeed the validity of the whole investigation.

Model 2:

similar in kind to Model 1, this more elaborate and detailed Model 2 is generated here following some 2 hours of telephonic discussion on 27/v with Tessa GIngell. The gratifying thing is that, working independently and with different sorts of evidence, we have both been moving towards similar interpretations based upon short-lived (EIA) occupation or occupations within a long land-use history on this particular area of Overton Down. I am here merely trying to capture ideas from this first moment of embryonic but serious data-integration. This second model, therefore, builds on further work done over the past week since Model 1 was developed, by Ian Blackwell on contextual analyses (not least `live` during and between today's telephone discussions) and by PJF in further attempts to draft bits of excavation report, notably about all the OD/X cuttings (those concerned with the perimeter and environs of the site).

TG indicated that, on provisional ceramic grounds, the site could have FOUR phases: ?LBA/VE[very early]EIA, EIA, MIA and LIA/early RB. This provisional framework is respected in the following by subdividing the settlement phases into a,b and c, though the overall site phasing stretches to five to allow for the Beaker and medieval phases. An attempt is made on the seven accompanying outline sketches (figs. 1-5), rough but to scale, to give a spatial and structural expression to the suggested time dimension. Fig 0 shows the properly prepared, hachured site plan resulting from metrical field survey. This is the graphic basis for the five Phases shown in figs 1-5 which have been traced from it. Fig. 6 provides some of the detail for crucial points in the interpretive arguments.

PHASE 1: three Beaker graves, on present evidence about their immediate environs in an 'empty' landscape though, looking at the wider local context (chap. 3), occurring in a landscape already littered with 'old' funereal, liturgical monuments (megalithic and earthen long barrows) and near-contemporary and current round barrows (plus the clear implication that other 'small flat cemeteries' were in use but have simply not been located by a monument-orientated sort of archaeology). **Fig 1** shows the graves as three dots and uses what would otherwise be a blank sheet of paper to give a scale (not repeated) and to outline simply for locational purposes the main earthworks on the site NOW: THERE IS NO IMPLICATION THAT ANY OF THESE OTHER FEATURES WERE PRESENT IN c1800 BC. The junction of three lynchets c50m NW of the graves is a constant graphic feature throughout all the figs.

PHASE 2 (FIG 2): between c1800-800 BC i.e. between whatever date is to be given to the Beaker and the earliest occupation material, so at the moment simply labelled BA: Site OD X/XI does not really exist as a separate entity at this stage, the area that it later occupied being simply a fragment of a an extensive, coaxial field system consisting basically of 60 x 50m field units. Most of the Site detail here is hypothetical, reconstructed from apparently significant on-site features interpreted in the wider landscape context; but into it is tentatively put the best-preserved blocks of ard-marks (without commitment at this stage of analysis, but to indicate that some at least of the marks belong to a **pre-settlement** phase), with a hint that if some of the field boundaries belong to a BA landscape phase then, whatever the date of the lynchets (not necessarily coeval with boundaries per se), some of the post-holes along the long-lived boundary line may well be BA.

PHASE 3 (figs 3a-c) is the period, possibly periods, of occupation. Its absolute date, and the length of the period(s) of occupation, are uncertain but archaeologically it begins with the earliest occupation pottery and ends with the latest pottery that can firmly be associated with settlement structure. At latest it is earlier than material associated with cultivation (Phase 4 below). As both TG and pjf/IB have independently gained the impression (NOT proof or even hard evidence) that their different evidences are pointing to a short length of time (??100-200 years??) for the whole of Phase 3, for the purposes of this model Phase 3 is here given outside limits of C9-6 BC (not least to provoke discussion, may I say that my own guess is that that bracket is too long and begins a bit too early, though clearly I await the WORD from Potterne: I would suggest three generations over a century either side of 700 for OD X/XI settlement, here Phase 3).

3a: is posited on the concept, hitherto not entertained, of a first occupation in the form of an open (or 'unenclosed') settlement. The concept is triggered by TG's evidence that, ceramically, Gully 5 (ODXI/A, cutting East 2 and 3) contains the earliest occupation material on the site. Noting that that from Gully 8 was ceramically sequential but so closely comparable that, even if perhaps slightly 'later', could well be contemporary, she asked whether previous interpretation of the structural sequence could be re-considered i.e. whether, instead of a trilobate building of G. 6/5/4 followed by G8 and then P.20 (see FWP 1, 2.4.ii), we could have a sequence of a trilobate G8/5/4 followed by G6 with G20 remaining later than G8 but otherwise 'floating' (if you really want to understand this crucial but technical and acrostically detailed argument, follow it on the annotated fig. 6). Interestingly, the same question had independently come to be asked by pjf in considering the structural evidence, and specifically whether the observation that the NE end of G5 was beside the N side of the exit from G6 allowed the inference that G6 was structurally related to a contemporary G5. Put other ways, two questions asked were whether G5 went with G8, allowing a useful northern dorrway between them, and, more fundamentally whether either G6 or G8 need be related structurally to G5 at all. One possibility still being considered is whether an eastern arc to complete a circle of G5 might not have been scrubbed out by TWO successive and independent buildings (i.e. G 6 and G8) overlapping that arc.

Fundamental to the detail behind such questions is the relationship between G6 and G8, two 'Gullies' (assumed to be palisade trenches - but that is another point for interpretive argument elsewhere) which do after all intersect. All drawings so far have shown G8 cutting G6, and all particular and general interpretation of the site has been based on an assumption that that was

the correct relationship. We have now gone back to the original record in all forms and at all levels and can confirm that structurally G8 does indeed cut G6. However, this rigorous re-examination of the record has raised a doubt, not about that relationship, but about the context of the pottery which led TG to ask her question. It may indeed all be from G6 and not from G8, having perhaps been wrongly observed, and therefore wrongly contextualised in its record, when found at the point of intersection i.e. it was actually in, or disturbed from, the filling of G6 when recorded as from G8. I am not totally convinced, but we can accommodate the ceramic point while not budging off the structural relationship that G8 is later than G6 (and incidentally that P20 therefore remains later still).

Fig. 3a therefore shows one round building (G5) with a southern annexe (G4); indicating that a third structure, G6, may either have been added to it to complete a trilobate building or, perhaps now more plausibly, was a replacement for it. Three dots to the W are specific pits but they stand for the probability that some of the pits belong to this phase, though not necessarily the three shown. Whatever the correctness or otherwise of such detail, overall the graphic expresses the idea of an open settlement lying within, indeed contained by, a 'Celtic' field now given over from arable to occupation but within a field system still continuing in arable use. The building complex - and we note that it is complex in plan, - is fairly central to the rectangular enclosure 'left', if such indeed was the case, by the converted 'Celtic' field.

PHASE 3b (fig 3b) is TG's 'very early EIA' (telecon). It is seen as the phase of major physical disruption when the size, nature and perhaps status of the settlement is changed to take local precedence over arable fields. An **enclosed** settlement, occupying three times the area of the original ex-'Celtic' field settlement of phase 3a, is created by digging some 400 m of ditch and (presumably) at the very least heaping up some form of accompanying bank (primary evidence for the existence of any bank is slight in fact and its existence is largely inferential; there is no direct evidence of its structure if it did exist; we have no evidence whatsoever about an entrance: this whole matter is dealt with in an embryonic FWP 4, 'towards a text of the excavation report on OD XI', not yet ready for circulation). Locally, the field system is permanently warped by the 'bite' of the northern arc of the enclosure into two fields N of the 3a settlement; the curve is still there as an earthwork on the ground. The enclosure's southern boundary also laid out a line which was for ever after respected: it predetermined the position of the double-lynchet also still a prominent earthwork. Inside, interpretation is tentative but one round house with annexe, Gully 1 underneath the 'straight' lynchet down the middle of fig. 1, is shown, partly on the basis of early hints from TG, partly because being some 10 m W of G5/6 it is near the centre of the new enclosure. It could be that one or two other buildings (G8 and that in South 1??) also belong here. The squiggle S of the building in fig. 3b indicates the area of 'working hollow' found in South 1, overlain by the house there (so if that house belongs in this phase, probably the 'working hollow' should go back to 3a).

PHASE 3c (fig. 3c) is provided to accommodate a 'late' phase of EIA enclosed settlement; but whether or not the 'right' house or houses are shown in it is currently uncertain. Apparently ceramic hints are present indicating that something like the graphic might be correct; one element of the model behind it is that the general building sequence is from complex to simple - so we end up with one or two round houses. That near the centre is the one in South 1, not far off the enclosure centre, later than the 'working hollow' and with a markedly bigger palisade trench (though I suspect this may be because we 'caught' it at a relatively higher level than was the case with the other 'gullies' - which, if so, might itself hint that this is a later structure). The building to the N is G8, shown here partly because its relationship to the 'surrounding' bank is interpreted as being significant i.e. the building is where it is because the bank was in existence.

PHASE 4 (fig.4) really represents in graphic terms the result of a second major disruption - the ending of the settlement, probably deliberately through razing it, and the re-conversion of the area it occupied back to arable, with a new field boundary being inserted right through the middle of the settlement (as the subsequent formation of a lynchet along that boundary over Gully 1 'proves').

[memo for pjf/IB: ? of the ? comparable subdivision of the Headlands EIA enclosed settlement into roughly equal parts by the ostensibly C10 Anglo-Saxon estate boundary: is this documented boundary perhaps following an earlier boundary or are we seeing the archaeological evidence for a repeating act of subdivision?]. *continues*

It is not at all certain what else should/could go on this figure 4, though there can be little or no doubt about the Phase. Some, probably most, of the ard-marks should appear here, representing serial (probably also cereal - sorry, corny pun) acts of cultivation within the new fields either side of the new boundary; and there clearly should be more field boundaries though which ones is not yet clear. The `new` possibility to come out of this rethink is that the double-lynchet track, hitherto regarded axiomatically as (?early?) RB, is shown as belonging to this phase.

But that really begs a major question: at the moment the date of this phase is unknown, though it is bracketed between the latest occupation of 3c and early Roman. What is locally a major phase of land reorganisation should theoretically come either immediately after 3c or with another separately recognised and dated landscape re-organisation c AD 100. To provide a reason for flattening the settlement, and because the DL track was apparently laid out respecting the ditch of the EIA enclosure, here I am opting for settlement subdivision and DL track going together AND belonging to (somewhere in) the mid-1st millennium BC.

[There should therefore be here a Phase 5 for the archaeologically and ceramically witnessed late prehistoric/RB phase but I am holding back on that, not because it is unsubstantiated but because it might well incorporate what is identified above as Phase 4)

PHASE 5 (fig 5) completes the land-use history in as far as it can be represented graphically by structures. It is a long gap from AD 400-1250 but there is nothing on the site to show for it. Similarly there is a long span between 1300 and the present, though we could present a version of the site plan showing the 1940s when the Army was imprinting its presence on the area.

Fig. 5 shows in thick lines essentially the same features of the present earthworks which appear on fig. 1. The thin broken lines represent the pattern of ridge-and furrow over the site i.e. the lines do not accurately show individual ridges or furrows but en bloc they accurately show alignments of what is here justifiably to be called `broad rig` (for the ridges are 27 ft. wide), the headlands between the furlongs (partly in the open, partly at `Celtic` field lynchets), and relationships to earlier earthworks. The C13 date is taken from the similar evidence on Fyfield Down, though I understand there is a little medieval pottery from ODX/XI. It is apparent that virtually the whole of the LBA/EIA settlement area was overploughed, though unploughed `gores` exist either side of the straight central lynchet across the settlement. As represented by existing ridge-and-furrow, all the medieval cultivation over the settlement area was N-S, so at the very least the E-W ard-marks cannot be attributed to medieval ploughing (unless a phase of medieval cultivation unrepresented by and earlier than the existing r-and-f is postulated).

The `old grassland` still over the area, one of the prime reasons for Overton Down being designated an NNR, is only, or as much as, 700 years old. Like most things, not least archaeological interpretation, it depends on your viewpoint.

MODEL 3

Phase 1: Beaker cemetery as above in Phase 1, Model 2

Phase 2a: BA fields as above in Phase 2, Model 2 (but see below under 2b)

Phase 2b: some of the post-holes under the lynchet (see Phase 4 below) have LBA sherds in them. This evidence may mark the beginning of the phase of a BA but otherwise undated field system, in which case Phase 2 can re-integrate into a single Phase; but it is separated out into a and b at this stage in case an LBA phase of activity on earlier BA fields can be recognised.

Phase 3a: marked by the earliest IA occupation material on the site in G5, with which goes ceramically, albeit structurally sequentially, G4 and G6 either as an eventually trilobate building or with G6 as a stand-alone round house replacing G5/4. Pits 13 and 19 fit here. Pending something early from the ditch coming to light, this phase is postulated as **unenclosed**.

Phase 3b: it was agreed the TG/pjf that this enumeration, 3b, should be used for the phase that began with the making of a bank and ditch to form an enclosure i.e. it is the first phase of enclosed settlement on the site = TG's `standard mainstream EIA` of ?C8-6 BC. It contains: G8, either as a stand-alone round house or as a replacement for G6 in continuing to provide an eastern part of a trilobate building i.e. the unshakeable structural evidence that G8 cuts G6 can be accepted but not much of a time-gap between them, and indeed between G8 and G5/4, is envisaged. The position of G8 is seen as constrained by the back of the enclosure bank. It remains structurally earlier than, but ceramically indistinguishable from, P20. Probably many of the excavated features - pits etc., - belong to this phase. The `working hollow` in South 1 appears to 3b - or be earlier, since it is its filling that contains a few `standard EIA` sherds. Pits 1 and 2 on the NW under the lynchet should belong in this phase since both are cut by G1 of a Phase 3c building; note that Pit 2 is `ritual` with ox and horse skulls on top. Pits 22 and 23 in East 3 also ceramically fit here, even though they would appear to have been under the theoretical bank of this Phase had it existed. There is a problem here: could they belong to the very end of Phase 3a, immediately before the bank was cast up? Or could they belong to a brief phase of activity **after** removal of the bank but before renewed cultivation (Phase 4)?

Phase 3c: contains the two other houses, G1 under the lynchet in East 1 and that in South 1 (also labelled Gully 1 at the time, since each area of excavation began with its own numbers after its own prefix); but, while it is not yet known whether these buildings are structurally or ceramically in use simultaneously or sequentially, they appear to be very close in time. They cannot be related stratigraphically, but South 1 cuts through `working hollows` with Phase 3b sherds. For interpretive purposes at this stage, using a `single-house model` as guide, G1 building in East 1 is put first because it is near the centre of the enclosure and retains the idea of `complexity` in that it has an annexe, though it is simpler than (and therefore a development from?) G4/5/6/8; and G1 South is put second because it is structurally different from the others in having a more substantial foundation trench and it is also a simple round building in plan i.e. there too is a `from complexity to simplicity` hypothesis at work in this model. TG indicated a marginal preference for South 1 preceding G1 East. Maybe this is something that further analysis of pit contents can resolve, because both buildings relate to pits. Structurally Pit 20 should come in here but ceramically it appears to belong to the end of 3b. Pits 1 and 2 The enclosure ditch, as evidenced in cutting X/15 to the south, GF 513, contains `standard` EIA pottery of Phase 3b with some 3c too (check with TG).

Phase 4: begins with the enclosed settlement ending - suddenly or violently is an issue to be left for further consideration: the point for present purposes is that occupation ceases and the site abandoned ceramically (if I can put it that way) by the mid-C6 BC. It is conspicuously lacking in `middle IA` material (saucepan pots etc) and ceramically there is a long gap until bead-rims (Phase 5 below). In land-use terms, however, the settlement area was converted into arable fields. At the moment it is not clear whether this happens immediately after the end of the occupation - therefore providing a reason for the cessation, as has always been thought in site interpretation, - or some time after. Ceramically, the long straight N-S lynchet across the site is

`mid-IA at earliest`. It is later than Pits 1 and 2 beneath it and the northerly of the two G1s (and it may yet be possible to demonstrate that it is stratigraphically later than G1 South too). It is also cut by `RB Pit 3` (see phase 5 below), implying that cultivation had to have lasted sufficiently long before AD ?C1 for the lynchet to have accumulated. Whatever the absolute date, most of the ard-marks probably belong to this Phase since they clearly relate to the straight lynchet (and corresponding sides of a squarish field: detailed analysis of the ard-marks is proceeding as this is keyed and it is beginning to look as if it will be theoretically possible to suggest perhaps three major phases - ?Phases 2, 4 & 5 of this Model? - with several `operational ploughings` within each). A preferred `interpretive hunch` at this stage is that the settlement was abandoned and its area was re-used for cultivation a bit later but still before a `saucepan pot` horizon. Perhaps the earthworks of earlier fields and the settlement enclosure remained visible, rather than being flattened, and were therefore lightly ploughed over, smoothed but still retaining their shape.

Phase 5: is a (possibly very late prehistoric and) RB phase, probably beginning in the mid/late C1, marked ceramically by bead-rims and some `proper` Roman sherds. Indeed there is a general if thin spread of RB material across the site, invariably occurring in the top layers (mainly layers 1 & 2, with a few in other `late` contexts). This material is interpreted as marking a renewed phase of agricultural activity, here arable probably with some of the ard-marks and the sherds representing manuring rather than on-site occupation. There is a spread of earlyish RB pottery over much of the downland, though it seems to go on later variously. There is also structural evidence for landscape re-organisation as well as land-use change in the C1-2 over much of the whole area studied, so an RB phase 5 on OD X/XI is contextually plausible. The double-lynchet track, such a prominent feature locally, has always been thought to fit in here as part of the early RB landscape intensification. The point that its location and alignment on ODX/XI presupposes a knowledge of the S side of the Phase 3b settlement enclosure can be met if the enclosure is not razed at the start of Phase 4 but allowed to persist in a ploughed down form through the M and LIA up to Phase 5. Indeed, its flattening could well have occurred then, since other prehistoric works were overlaid etc. elsewhere at this time (but see Phase 6 below). Pit 3 belongs here but other RB features have not (yet?) been identified on site

Phase 6: is exactly the same as Phase 5 on Model 2 i.e. arable fields in furlongs, still marked on the ground by `broad rig`. Perhaps it was at this stage, rather than in the mid-IA or RB period, that all the earthworks were finally flattened, other than those still visible and shown on fig. 1.

Summary of Model 3

Phase 1: Beaker graves

Phase 2: a: BA field system

b: LBA activity on a field within continuing arable system

Phase 3: a: Unenclosed EIA settlement on a field within a continuing system

: single complex house

(C8-6) b: Enclosed EIA settlement carved out of field system which continues

to operate in surrounding area: single less complex house & working hollow

c: Enclosed EIA settlement continues with successive round houses

Phase 4: settlement abandoned and its area cultivated in fields, producing ard-marks

Phase 5: C1 AD and later: renewed and intensified agrarian activity including trackway cutting Phase 2 fields but respecting Phase 3 enclosure

Phase 6: medieval (?C13) cultivation, partly fitting in earlier land arrangements